arXiv:1608.06967v1 [math.CO] 24 Aug 2016

An Elementary Proof of Bevan's Theorem On the Growth of Grid Classes of Permutations

Michael Albert
Department of Computer Science
University of Otago
Dunedin, New Zealand

Vincent Vatter*
Department of Mathematics
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida USA

Bevan established that the growth rate of a monotone grid class of permutations is equal to the square of the spectral radius of a related bipartite graph. We give an elementary and self-contained proof of a generalization of this result using only Stirling's Formula, the method of Lagrange multipliers, and the singular value decomposition of matrices.

1. Introduction

Herein we provide an elementary proof for a theorem giving the asymptotic enumeration of certain permutation classes called grid classes. For a broad overview of permutation classes, we refer the reader to the second author's survey [6], and here give only the necessary definitions.

Two finite sequences of distinct real numbers are *order isomorphic* if they have the same relative comparisons. Thus the order isomorphism of the sequences $a(1), \dots, a(k)$ and $b(1), \dots, b(k)$ is equivalent to the statement that $a(i) < a(j)$ if and only if $b(i) < b(j)$ for all i and j. The permutation π of length n, thought of in one line notation as the sequence $\pi(1)\cdots\pi(n)$, is said to *contain* the permutation σ if π has a subsequence which is order isomorphic to σ. Otherwise we say that π *avoids* σ. For example, the permutation 41523 contains 231 because of its subsequence 452 but avoids 321 because it does not contain three entries in decreasing order.

This relation is a partial order on the set of all finite permutations, and a *permutation class* is a downset in this order. Thus if $\mathcal{C}$ is a permutation class, $\pi \in \mathcal{C}$, and σ is contained in π then $\sigma \in \mathcal{C}$. We denote by $\mathcal{C}_n$ the set of permutations of length n in the class $\mathcal{C}$ and define the *growth rate* of $\mathcal{C}$ by

$$\mathrm{gr}(\mathcal{C}) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sqrt[n]{|\mathcal{C}_n|}$$

if this limit exists (it is conjectured that this limit always exists; in cases where it is not known to exist we often instead consider the *upper growth rate* of $\mathcal{C}$, obtained by replacing the limit above by a limit superior). More generally, for any collection of discrete structures we define the (upper)

*Vatter's research was partially supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant Number DMS-1301692.
Date: August 26, 2016
AMS 2000 Subject Classification. 05A05, 05A15

growth rate to be the limit (superior) of the n^{th} root of the number of structures of size n in the collection as $n \to \infty$. From the resolution of the Stanley–Wilf Conjecture by Marcus and Tardos [4] it follows that—except for the degenerate case of the class of all permutations—all growth rates of permutation classes are finite.

We are interested in a particular construction of permutation classes, called *(generalized) grid classes*, which were first introduced in the second author's work on the classification of the set of growth rates of permutation classes [5].

Suppose that $\mathcal{M}$ is a $t \times u$ matrix of permutation classes. An *$\mathcal{M}$-gridding* of the permutation π of length n is a pair of sequences $1 = c_1 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant c_{t+1} = n+1$ (the column divisions) and $1 = r_1 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant r_{u+1} = n+1$ (the row divisions) such that for all $1 \leqslant k \leqslant t$ and $1 \leqslant \ell \leqslant u$, the entries of π with indices in $[c_k, c_{k+1})$ and values in $[r_\ell, r_{\ell+1})$ are in the same relative order as an element of $\mathcal{M}_{k,\ell}$. The *grid class of* $\mathcal{M}$, denoted $\mathrm{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$, is defined as the class of all permutations which possess an $\mathcal{M}$-gridding.

The main theorem of this paper, below, shows that the growth rate of $\mathrm{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$ is an eigenvalue of a closely related matrix.

Theorem 1. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a $t \times u$ matrix of permutation classes, each with a proper growth rate, and let a $t \times u$ matrix Γ with entries in $\mathbb{R}$ be defined by $\Gamma_{k,\ell} = \sqrt{\mathrm{gr}(\mathcal{M}_{k,\ell})}$. Then the growth rate of $\mathrm{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$ is equal to the greatest eigenvalue of $\Gamma^T\Gamma$ (or equivalently, of $\Gamma\Gamma^T$).*

Before beginning the proof, a few comments are in order. First, if the cells of $\mathcal{M}$ do not have growth rates then setting $\Gamma_{k,\ell}$ instead equal to the square root of the upper growth rate of $\mathcal{M}_{k,\ell}$ gives an upper bound on the upper growth rate of $\mathrm{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$, but we do not know that it is in fact the upper growth rate of $\mathrm{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$.

More significantly, Theorem 1 is a generalization of the work of Bevan. In [2], he showed how to compute the growth rates of *monotone* grid classes, which are grid classes in which the cells may contain only the class of increasing permutations (those avoiding 21), the class of decreasing permutations (those avoiding 12), or the empty class. Thus in applying Theorem 1 to such classes, each entry of Γ is either 0 or 1. Via a delicate argument, Bevan showed that the growth rate of such a grid class is equal to the square of the spectral radius of a certain bipartite graph associated to the matrix defining the class. Although the matrix occurring in Bevan's result is not the same as the matrix Γ, it is a routine exercise in linear algebra to show that the formula in Theorem 1 is equivalent to Bevan's formula in these cases.

Finally, because of this connection to spectral radii of graphs, the extensive literature on algebraic graph theory can be applied directly to the characterization of growth rates of monotone grid classes. We refer the reader to Bevan [2, Section 4] for these implications. Further applications of Theorem 1, to growth rates of merges of permutation classes, are described in Albert, Pantone, and Vatter [1].

2. Restricting to a Connected Component

We call a permutation $\pi \in \mathrm{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$ together with a fixed $\mathcal{M}$-gridding an *$\mathcal{M}$-gridded permutation*, and we denote by $\mathrm{Grid}^\sharp(\mathcal{M})$ the collection of all $\mathcal{M}$-gridded permutations. Every permutation $\pi \in \mathrm{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$ has at least one gridding that witnesses its membership in the grid class, so trivially $|\mathrm{Grid}_n(\mathcal{M})| \leqslant |\mathrm{Grid}_n^\sharp(\mathcal{M})|$. Conversely, there are at most $n+1$ positions in which a vertical (resp.,

horizontal) line can be placed in a permutation of length n, and thus we have

$$|\mathrm{Grid}_n(\mathcal{M})| \leqslant \left|\mathrm{Grid}_n^\sharp(\mathcal{M})\right| \leqslant (n+1)^{t+u} |\mathrm{Grid}_n(\mathcal{M})|.$$

In particular, because $(n+1)^{(t+u)/n} \to 1$ as $n \to \infty$, the upper growth rates of $\mathrm{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$ and $\mathrm{Grid}^\sharp(\mathcal{M})$ are the same. For this reason, we work only in the gridded context for the rest of the proof.

Next, cells of $\mathcal{M}$ which contain finite classes (i.e., those of growth rate 0) clearly do not affect the growth rate of $\mathrm{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$. Thus we may assume that every cell of $\mathcal{M}$ is either empty or is equal to an infinite permutation class, in which case it contains at least one member of every length.

We associate to the matrix $\mathcal{M}$ a *cell graph* in the following manner. The vertices of the cell graph are the nonempty cells of $\mathcal{M}$, and two cells are adjacent if they lie in the same row or column. We extend certain terms about the cell graph of $\mathcal{M}$ to $\mathcal{M}$ itself, saying that $\mathcal{M}$ is *connected* if its cell graph is connected, and referring to the submatrices of $\mathcal{M}$ which correspond to connected components of its cell graph as the *connected components* of $\mathcal{M}$.

One advantage of working in $\mathrm{Grid}^\sharp(\mathcal{M})$ is that permutations of the rows and columns of $\mathcal{M}$ do not change the number of $\mathcal{M}$-gridded permutations of a given length. Thus in computing the growth rate of $\mathrm{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$ we may assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is given in block diagonal form, and in this form the blocks are precisely the connected components of $\mathcal{M}$. The gridded permutations of $\mathrm{Grid}^\sharp(\mathcal{M})$ are thus in bijection with tuples of gridded members of the grid classes of the components of $\mathcal{M}$. From this it follows that the upper growth rate of $\mathrm{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$ is equal to the greatest upper growth rate of the grid class of a connected component of $\mathcal{M}$.

Analogously, if $\mathcal{M}$ is given in block diagonal form then $\Gamma^T\Gamma$ and $\Gamma\Gamma^T$ will be in block diagonal form. Thus the eigenvalues of these matrices are precisely the eigenvalues of their blocks, which correspond to the connected components of $\mathcal{M}$. Therefore, it suffices to prove Theorem 1 in the case that $\mathcal{M}$ is connected.

3. Translation to a Continuous Problem

For the rest of the note we assume $\mathcal{M}$ is a fixed, connected, $t \times u$ matrix of empty and infinite permutation classes, each with a proper growth rate. The results of this section and the next, in the special case of monotone grid classes, are stated without proof in Bevan's thesis [3, Chapter 6].

We say that the $t \times u$ matrix A with non-negative integer entries is *admissible* if $A_{k,\ell} = 0$ whenever $\mathcal{M}_{k,\ell} = \varnothing$. We refer to the sum of the entries of a matrix as its *weight*. If A is an admissible matrix of weight n, we denote by $\mathrm{Grid}_A^\sharp(\mathcal{M})$ the subset of $\mathrm{Grid}_n^\sharp(\mathcal{M})$ consisting of those gridded permutations such that the number of entries belonging to the cell in row k and column ℓ is $A_{k,\ell}$. The sets $\mathrm{Grid}_A^\sharp(\mathcal{M})$ allow us to express the collection of $\mathcal{M}$-gridded permutations as a disjoint union

$$\mathrm{Grid}_n^\sharp(\mathcal{M}) = \biguplus_{\substack{\text{admissible } A \\ \text{of weight } n}} \mathrm{Grid}_A^\sharp(\mathcal{M}).$$

In the statement of our next observation, and throughout the rest of the note, for any matrix A we denote by $\sum A_{k,\bullet}$ the sum of its k^{th} row and by $\sum A_{\bullet,\ell}$ the sum of its ℓ^{th} column.

Proposition 2. *For every admissible matrix A we have*

$$|\operatorname{Grid}_A^\sharp(\mathcal{M})| = \prod_{k=1}^{t} \binom{\sum A_{k,\bullet}}{A_{k,1},\ldots,A_{k,u}} \prod_{\ell=1}^{u} \binom{\sum A_{\bullet,\ell}}{A_{1,\ell},\ldots,A_{t,\ell}} \prod_{\substack{k,\ell \\ \mathcal{M}_{k,\ell}\neq\varnothing}} (\mathcal{M}_{k,\ell})_{A_{k,\ell}}.$$

Proof. The factors of the first product count the number of way in which the entries of the gridded permutation can be arranged vertically within each row. Those of the second product perform the analogous task for the columns. At this point we have determined the horizontal and vertical positions which are occupied in each cell and it remains only to determine the permutation that the entries of each cell form. If $\mathcal{M}_{k,\ell} \neq \varnothing$, the $A_{k,\ell}$ entries in the cell (k,ℓ) can be any permutation (of appropriate length) in $\mathcal{M}_{k,\ell}$. □

For each positive integer n, let A_n^* denote an admissible matrix of weight n which maximizes $|\operatorname{Grid}_A^\sharp(\mathcal{M})|$ over all admissible matrices of weight n. Since $\operatorname{Grid}_n^\sharp(\mathcal{M})$ is the disjoint union of $\operatorname{Grid}_A^\sharp(\mathcal{M})$ over all admissible matrices, and because there are fewer than $(n+1)^{tu}$ admissible matrices of weight n, we have the bound

$$|\operatorname{Grid}_{A_n^*}^\sharp(\mathcal{M})| \leqslant |\operatorname{Grid}_n^\sharp(\mathcal{M})| \leqslant (n+1)^{tu} |\operatorname{Grid}_{A_n^*}^\sharp(\mathcal{M})|.$$

The polynomial factor on the right does not affect upper growth rates, yielding the following.

Proposition 3. *There is a sequence $\{A_n^*\}$ of admissible matrices such that the weight of A_n^* is n and the upper growth rate of* $\operatorname{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$ *is equal to*

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} |\operatorname{Grid}_{A_n^*}^\sharp(\mathcal{M})|^{1/n}.$$

Given an admissible matrix, we may scale it by dividing each of its entries by its weight (we do this in order to later form a convergent subsequence of such scaled matrices). Each scaled matrix so obtained lies in the *admissible domain* $\mathbf{W} \subseteq [0,1]^{t\times u}$ consisting of all matrices W of weight 1 such that $\mathcal{M}_{k,\ell} = \varnothing$ implies $W_{k,\ell} = 0$. On the other hand, given an arbitrary $W \in \mathbf{W}$ the matrix $\lfloor nW \rfloor$ defined by $\lfloor nW \rfloor_{k,\ell} = \lfloor nW_{k,\ell} \rfloor$ is admissible and has weight at most n.

Next we define a function $f : \mathbf{W} \to \mathbb{R}$ which is related to an approximation of the formula for $|\operatorname{Grid}_A^\sharp(\mathcal{M})|$ in Proposition 2. To motivate its definition, consider that for a matrix A whose nonzero entries are large, Stirling's formula shows that

$$\binom{\sum A_{k,\bullet}}{A_{k,1},\ldots,A_{k,u}} \sim \sqrt{\frac{\sum A_{k,\bullet}}{(2\pi)^{u-1}\prod A_{k,\bullet}}} \cdot \frac{(\sum A_{k,\bullet})^{(\sum A_{k,\bullet})}}{A_{k,1}^{A_{k,1}} \cdots A_{k,u}^{A_{k,u}}}.$$

As we will take n^{th} roots, the quantity in the square root above can be ignored, leaving us with the fraction

$$\frac{(\sum A_{k,\bullet})^{(\sum A_{k,\bullet})}}{A_{k,1}^{A_{k,1}} \cdots A_{k,u}^{A_{k,u}}}.$$

In forming the product in Proposition 2, each row contributes one of these numerators, each column contributes a similar numerator, and the term $A_{k,\ell}^{A_{k,\ell}}$ occurs in precisely two of the denominators.

The cell (k, ℓ) also contributes the factor $(\mathcal{M}_{k,\ell})_{A_{k,\ell}}$, which we can approximate by $\Gamma_{k,\ell}^{2A_{k,\ell}}$ because the growth rate of $\mathcal{M}_{k,\ell}$ is $\Gamma_{k,\ell}^2$. We therefore define $f : \mathbf{W} \to \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} f(W) &= \prod_{k=1}^{t} \left(\sum W_{k,\bullet}\right)^{(\sum W_{k,\bullet})} \prod_{\ell=1}^{u} \left(\sum W_{\bullet,\ell}\right)^{(\sum W_{\bullet,\ell})} \prod_{k,\ell} \Gamma_{k,\ell}^{2W_{k,\ell}} W_{k,\ell}^{-2W_{k,\ell}}, \\ &= \prod_{\substack{k,\ell \\ W_{k,\ell}\neq 0}} \left(\frac{\Gamma_{k,\ell}^2 \left(\sum W_{k,\bullet}\right)\left(\sum W_{\bullet,\ell}\right)}{W_{k,\ell}^2}\right)^{W_{k,\ell}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the combinatorial interpretation $0^0 = 1$ is used if necessary.

The admissible domain is compact, so we can find a subsequence of $\{A_n^*\}$ for which the sequence $\{A_n^*/n\}$ converges point-wise to some matrix $W^* \in \mathbf{W}$. Then, assuming that the cells of $\mathcal{M}$ all have proper growth rates, an application of Stirling's Formula followed by taking n^{th} roots and limits shows that the upper growth rate of $\mathrm{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$ is equal to $f(W^*)$. This is the only place in the argument where the hypothesis that the cells of $\mathcal{M}$ have proper growth rates is used.

Conversely, for an arbitrary $W \in \mathbf{W}$, the same application of Stirling's Formula, n^{th} roots, and limits shows that

$$f(W) = \lim_{n\to\infty} |\operatorname{Grid}^\sharp_{\lfloor nW\rfloor}(\mathcal{M})|^{1/n}.$$

We know that $|\operatorname{Grid}^\sharp_{\lfloor nW\rfloor}(\mathcal{M})| \leqslant |\operatorname{Grid}^\sharp_n(\mathcal{M})|$ for all n, so $f(W)$ is a lower bound on the limit inferior of the sequence $|\operatorname{Grid}^\sharp_n(\mathcal{M})|^{1/n}$. On the other hand, the upper growth rate of $\mathrm{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$ is achieved by a value of f. These considerations establish the following result, which reduces the problem of computing the growth rate of $\mathrm{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$ to that of maximizing f on the admissible domain.

Proposition 4. *If every cell of $\mathcal{M}$ has a proper growth rate then* $\mathrm{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$ *has a proper growth rate, and the value of this growth rate is equal to the maximum value of the function f on the admissible domain.*

4. Lagrange Multipliers

Next we characterize the maxima of f on the admissible domain. Recall that every matrix W in the admissible domain satisfies $W_{k,\ell} = 0$ when $\mathcal{M}_{k,\ell} = \varnothing$. Thus we view the maximization of f as a constrained optimization problem where the variables are those entries of W which are allowed to be nonzero and the constraint is that the sum of the variables is 1.

It is equivalent and more convenient to work with $\log f$, for which we compute the partial derivatives

$$\frac{\partial \log f}{\partial W_{k,\ell}} = \log\left(\sum W_{k,\bullet}\right) + \log\left(\sum W_{\bullet,\ell}\right) + 2\log\Gamma_{k,\ell} - 2\log W_{k,\ell}.$$

Before going on, some remarks about the locations of the maxima of f are required. First, there is a degenerate case that must be dispensed with. If $\mathcal{M}$ has a single nonempty cell, then Theorem 1 holds trivially. Thus we may assume that $\mathcal{M}$ has at least two nonempty cells.

By the argument from Section 2 we may assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is connected. Now suppose that for some $W \in \mathbf{W}$ we have $W_{k,\ell} = 0$ but $\mathcal{M}_{k,\ell}$ is nonempty. Because $\mathcal{M}$ is connected, if there are cells with

this property, we may choose one which lies in the same row and column as a nonzero cell of W. It then follows from our computation of the partial derivatives above that

$$\lim_{W_{k,\ell}\to 0^+} \frac{\partial f}{\partial W_{k,\ell}} = +\infty.$$

Therefore we may be confident that the maxima of f lie in the interior of the admissible domain, and thus can be found by the method of Lagrange multipliers.

Since the constraint is simply that the sum of the entries corresponding to non-empty cells of $\mathcal{M}$ should be 1, all of the partial derivatives must be the same at a maximizing point. Exponentiating them shows that at a maximizing point there is some positive number λ such that for all nonzero entries $W_{k,\ell}$,

$$\frac{\Gamma_{k,\ell}^2 \left(\sum W_{k,\bullet}\right)\left(\sum W_{\bullet,\ell}\right)}{W_{k,\ell}^2} = \lambda. \tag{$\dagger$}$$

Moreover, if ($\dagger$) holds for some $W \in \mathbf{W}$ then

$$f(W) = \prod_{\substack{k,\ell \\ W_{k,\ell}\neq 0}} \lambda^{W_{k,\ell}} = \lambda.$$

The equation ($\dagger$) is homogeneous in the sense that if the nonzero entries of W satisfy it then so do the nonzero entries of every scalar multiple of W. Therefore the growth rate of $\mathrm{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$ is the greatest value of λ for which we can find a nonnegative $t \times u$ matrix whose nonzero entries satisfy ($\dagger$). This concludes the analytic portion of the argument.

5. Singular Values

We refer the reader to any comprehensive linear algebra book for the full theory of singular value decompositions of matrices and simply state here the facts we require, specialized to our context.

The nonnegative real number s is a singular value of the $t \times u$ matrix Γ if there exist unit vectors $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^u$ and $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{R}^t$, called *left and right singular vectors*, such that

$$\Gamma\mathbf{c} = s\mathbf{r} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma^T\mathbf{r} = s\mathbf{c}.$$

Let s be a singular value of Γ. Every left singular vector $\mathbf{r}$ for s is an eigenvector of $\Gamma^T\Gamma$ for the eigenvalue s^2, while every right singular vector $\mathbf{c}$ for s is an eigenvalue of $\Gamma\Gamma^T$, also for the eigenvalue s^2.

Because Γ is nonnegative, it follows from the Perron–Frobenius Theorem that there are nonnegative left and right singular vectors for the greatest singular value of Γ. Our proof of Theorem 1 is completed by showing that if s is the greatest singular value of Γ then there is a matrix whose nonzero entries satisfy ($\dagger$) with $\lambda = s^2$ (Proposition 5), and if there is a matrix whose nonzero entries satisfy ($\dagger$) then $\sqrt{\lambda}$ is a singular value of Γ (Proposition 6). Together with our previous work, these results imply that the growth rate of $\mathrm{Grid}(\mathcal{M})$ is equal to the square of the greatest singular value of Γ, which is the greatest eigenvalue of $\Gamma^T\Gamma$, or equivalently, of $\Gamma\Gamma^T$.

Proposition 5. *Let $\mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{c}$ be nonnegative left and right singular vectors for the greatest singular value s of Γ and define the matrix W by $W_{k,\ell} = \Gamma_{k,\ell}\mathbf{r}_k\mathbf{c}_\ell$. Then W is nonnegative and its nonzero entries satisfy ($\dagger$) with $\lambda = s^2$.*

Proof. We need only compute the quantities which appear in (†). For the row sums, we see that

$$\sum W_{k,\bullet} = \mathbf{r}_k \sum_{j=1}^{u} \Gamma_{k,j}\mathbf{c}_j.$$

The sum on the right hand side is the inner product of the k^{th} row of Γ with $\mathbf{c}$, and thus because $\mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{c}$ are singular vectors of Γ corresponding to s, the quantity above is equal to $s\mathbf{r}_k^2$. Analogously, the column sums simplify as $\sum W_{\bullet,\ell} = s\mathbf{c}_\ell^2$. Therefore when $W_{k,\ell} \neq 0$ we have

$$\frac{\Gamma_{k,\ell}^2 \left(\sum W_{k,\bullet}\right)\left(\sum W_{\bullet,\ell}\right)}{W_{k,\ell}^2} = \frac{s^2\Gamma_{k,\ell}^2\mathbf{r}_k^2\mathbf{c}_\ell^2}{(\Gamma_{k,\ell}\mathbf{r}_k\mathbf{c}_\ell)^2} = s^2,$$

as desired. □

Proposition 6. *Suppose that W is a nonnegative matrix of weight 1 whose nonzero entries satisfy (†). Then $\sqrt{\lambda}$ is a singular value for Γ.*

Proof. Set $s = \sqrt{\lambda}$ and the define the vectors

$$\mathbf{r}_k = \sqrt{\sum W_{k,\bullet}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{c}_\ell = \sqrt{\sum W_{\bullet,\ell}}.$$

Both $\mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{c}$ are unit vectors because their norms are equal to the square root of the weight of W. Furthermore, solving (†) for $W_{k,\ell}$ shows that $W_{k,\ell} = \Gamma_{k,\ell}\mathbf{r}_k\mathbf{c}_\ell/s$. Thus when $\Gamma_{k,j} \neq 0$ we have

$$\mathbf{c}_j = \frac{sW_{k,j}}{\Gamma_{k,j}\mathbf{r}_k}.$$

This allows us to check that $\Gamma\mathbf{c} = s\mathbf{r}$. In particular, we see that

$$(\Gamma\mathbf{c})_k = \sum_{j=1}^{u} \Gamma_{k,j}\mathbf{c}_j = \frac{s}{\mathbf{r}_k}\sum W_{k,\bullet}.$$

The row sum $\sum W_{k,\bullet}$ is equal to $\mathbf{r}_k^2$ and thus $(\Gamma\mathbf{c})_k = s\mathbf{r}_k$, as desired. An analogous computation shows that $\Gamma^T\mathbf{r} = s\mathbf{c}$, completing the proof of the proposition and of Theorem 1. □

References

[1] Albert, M. H., Pantone, J., and Vatter, V. On the growth of merges and staircases of permutation classes. Preprint.

[2] Bevan, D. Growth rates of permutation grid classes, tours on graphs, and the spectral radius. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 367*, 8 (2015), 5863–5889.

[3] Bevan, D. *On the Growth of Permutation Classes*. PhD thesis, The Open University, 2015.

[4] Marcus, A., and Tardos, G. Excluded permutation matrices and the Stanley–Wilf conjecture. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 107*, 1 (2004), 153–160.

[5] Vatter, V. Small permutation classes. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) 103*, 5 (2011), 879–921.

[6] Vatter, V. Permutation classes. In *Handbook of Enumerative Combinatorics*, M. Bóna, Ed. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, 2015, pp. 754–833.